DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 827 CG 031 949

AUTHOR	Newgent, Rebecca A.; Parr, Patricia E.; Newman, Isadore
TITLE	The Enneagram: Trends in Validation.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classification; *Counseling Theories; *Evaluation Methods; *Personality Measures; *Theory Practice Relationship; *Validity
IDENTIFIERS	*Enneagrams

ABSTRACT

Counseling and educational professionals are encouraged to understand the research behind the theory and the development of a measure of personality in addition to the application of the measure. Personality assessment, especially in relation to the Enneagram classification system of personality, has been dramatically changing. Personality measures can be based in theory as well as utilize numerous developmental methods. Additionally, the scores from personality measures are validated in a variety of ways. Trends in validation related to the Enneagram system are becoming more rigorous. This trend necessitates a change in the manner in which counseling students, school counselors, professional counselors, counselor educators, and educational researchers are taught personality assessment. Further, this trend necessitates a change in the manner in which counseling and educational practitioners select assessments. A review of the literature on the validity of various Enneagram classification systems of personality is presented as well as implications for counselors and educators. (Contains 34 references.) (Author/GCP)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 827

Running head: TRENDS IN VALIDATION

The Enneagram: Trends in Validation

Rebecca A. Newgent

University of Arkansas – Fayetteville

Patricia E. Parr and Isadore Newman

The University of Akron

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. NEWGENT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Author Note

Rebecca A. Newgent, Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations, University of Arkansas – Fayetteville.

Patricia E. Parr, Department of Counseling, The University of Akron; Isadore Newman, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, The University of Akron.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rebecca A. Newgent, Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations, 236 Graduate Education Building, University of Arkansas - Fayetteville, Fayetteville, Arkansas, 72701. E-mail: rnewgent@uark.edu

CG031949

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Counseling and educational professionals are encouraged to understand the research behind the theory and the development of a measure of personality in addition to the application of the measure. Personality assessment, especially in relation to the Enneagram classification system of personality, has been dramatically changing. Personality measures can be based in theory as well as utilize numerous developmental methods. Additionally, the scores from personality measures are validated in a variety of ways. Trends in validation related to the Enneagram system are becoming more rigorous. This trend necessitates a change in the manner in which counseling students, school counselors, professional counselors, counselor educators, and educational researchers are taught personality assessment. Further, this trend necessitates a change in the manner in which counseling and educational practitioners select assessments. A review of the literature on the validity of various Enneagram classification systems of personality is presented as well as implications for counselors and educators.

The Enneagram: Trends in Validation

Personality is one of the most pervasive constructs in the helping professions. According to Lanyon and Goodstein (1971) personality assessment can be traced back to 3000 B.C. The history of personality assessment includes palmistry, astrology, and phrenology. As the 20th century progressed and personality assessment became an important tool in the helping professions, many methods with which to assess personality were developed. These methods, according to Sherman (1979) include self-reports, mood checklists, interviews, and objectives and projective tools.

Based upon a review of the literature, a lack of empirical research and psychometric assessment on Enneagram classification system of personality exists. This paucity in the literature may be due to the weaknesses in psychometric development and validation of the Enneagram classification system of personality. The purpose of this review is to examine the trends of validation in the Enneagram classification system of personality and the related implications for the counseling and education professions. This review consists of three sections. The first section presents the theory of the Enneagram. The second section presents Enneagram classification systems and associated research on the validity of those systems. Finally, the third section presents the implications for the counseling and education professions related to the integration of personality theory, assessment, development, and practice.

The Theory of the Enneagram

While many personality measurement inventories can be traced back to a particular theory or theorist, the Enneagram classification system purports that no one underlying theory or theoretical explanation is the basis for how and why the Enneagram system works. According to

Riso and Hudson (1996), "The Enneagram is a universal psychological symbol, one which can accommodate many different interpretations while retaining its unique character" (p. 445).

The Enneagram has been interpreted in relation to the typologies of Karen Horney, Sigmund Freud, and Carl Jung. The typology of Karen Horney posits that there are three neurotic solutions. In relation to the typology of Karen Horney each of the Enneagram triads consists of each of Horney's solutions (Riso & Hudson, 1996). The Enneagram Feeling Triad relates to Horney's compliant, aggressive, and withdrawn solutions respectively. The Enneagram Thinking Triad relates to Horney's withdrawn, compliant, and aggressive solutions respectively. Finally, the Enneagram Instinctive Triad relates to Horney's aggressive, withdrawn, and compliant solutions respectively. Freudian concepts included the idea of fixation. According to Freud's theory, fixation occurs in three areas, the mouth (oral stage), the anus (the anal stage), and the genitals (the phallic stage). Additionally, at each of these stages fixation can result in three characteristics: receptive, retentive, and expulsive. Thus, there is a possibility of nine dispositions. The Enneagram system, according to Riso and Hudson (1996), correspond to these nine Freudian dispositions. The eight psychological types of Jungian typology appear to also correspond to the nine types of the Enneagram system in varying degrees. With the exception of Enneagram type Three (the Achiever) the Jungian typologies correspond to the Enneagram types.

While the Enneagram system does overlap with the theories of Karen Horney, Sigmund Freud, and Carl Jung the correspondence between the Enneagram classification system and these aforementioned theorists do not appear to account for all the aspects or constructs of personality purported by Enneagram theory. One would then question if a more appropriate theory would

account for more of the constructs in the Enneagram classification system or if Enneagram development needs to be furthered.

Enneagram Classification Systems

As of yet, many personality assessments have no record of validity. The Enneagram system has made some movement in this direction (e.g., Brugha, 1998; Gamard, 1986; Newgent, 2001; Perry, 1996; Sharp, 1994; Thrasher, 1994; Twomey, 1995; Wagner, 1981; Wagner, & Walker, 1983; Wyman, 1998). In this section, a review of Enneagram classification system in general, the systems of Wagner, Cohen-Palmer, Zinkle, and the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator will be reviewed in relation to trends in validation.

Studies

Many studies on the Enneagram system that allude to the usefulness of the interpretations appear to be based on anecdotal support. For example, in an analysis of the Enneagram system, Gamard (1986) examined the interrater reliability and validity ratings of judges in classifying subjects ($N = 36$; 2 male and 2 female for each Enneagram type) into nine personality types. A positive relationship was found between agreement of judgments and length of experience. This was evidenced by the mean Kappa coefficient of the more experienced judges of .248 for within-group agreement and .252 for agreement with the criterion rating. The test-retest Kappa for the more experienced judges was .550 after two and one half years and .300 to .275 compared to the criterion rating.

In another investigation related to the Enneagram and self-knowledge, Perry (1996) completed a qualitative dissertation examining a critical incident using the Enneagram model and the Brent Personality Assessment System. To assess the usefulness of these instruments to personal growth and self-knowledge the subjects ($N = 14$) analyzed the critical incident in terms

of their experience with these measures. Participants, in relation to the Enneagram system's importance in self-understanding, reported positive responses.

Cusack (1996) found information from the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (RHETI) helpful with a variety of circumstances and purposes such as educators working with each other, educators working with parents, and improving relationships between administrators and educators through effective communication. Cusack (1996) also found the information from the RHETI helpful with identifying students' strengths, and increasing adolescent self-understanding and relating positive parenting practices to their parents.

In an attempt to help others better understand the self, Brugha (1998) completed a qualitative study on the structure of development decision-making. Brugha (1998) identified the structure of development decision-making as a four-fold cycle: proposition, perception, pull, and push. Kubler-Ross' (1969) religious stages of personal development, Maslow's (1987) hierarchy of needs, the Enneagram (Riso, 1987), and the Jungian personality typing systems (Jung, 1971) were utilized to examine this structure. Brugha (1998) found that the Enneagram system advice tended not to be transparent or obvious. "The structure of development decision-making should help to clarify and simplify this advice" (p. 91).

Wyman (1998) utilized the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & Briggs, 1976) and the Enneagram in combination as a psychotherapeutic model to provide a profile of the core self and the defense system. The purpose of this study was to explore how the two systems correspond. Wyman (1998) found that a much clearer picture of the individual came from this combination.

In a case study of the RHETI, Pinder (2000) stated, "If career counselors understand the underlying philosophy of the Enneagram and apply the tool with critical and creative thinking,

they can play a significant role in assisting individuals, groups, and society in fulfilling their purposes" (p. 155). Further, Newgent, Perosa, and Perosa (2000) found the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator, Version 2.0 (Riso, 1995) to be a useful tool in career exploration and identification of career obstacles in a multicultural classroom environment of at-risk high school students. Results indicated a clear classroom personality existed. Characteristics of this classroom personality were then to be utilized to address the programmatic needs of a multicultural urban classroom environment.

These studies on the Enneagram system found support for the usefulness of the interpretations from the Enneagram. However, this support was mostly anecdotal in nature. For example, Gamard's (1986) investigation indicated that interrater reliability and validity of judgments of Enneagram personality types was at best fair. While this result is positive, the potential for the Enneagram's use in future investigations can be increased by providing increased training, clearer criteria, and empirical validation of the measure. No actual instrument was utilized in Perry's (1996) study and subjects had prior knowledge of the Enneagram model of self-understanding. Brugha's (1998) study argues that to understand ones own personality, subjects need a better understanding of the Enneagram system. Using the Enneagram and the MBTI as in Wyman's (1998) can aid the helping professional in providing clearer information on individual differences and potentially improve therapy. It appears from these investigations that the Enneagram system has much intuitive value. Yet, to apply these results to the population, empirical validity must be examined.

Gamard's (1986) and Perry's (1996) Brugha's (1998) studies require prior knowledge and training of the Enneagram system for a better understanding of the interpretations. While an understanding of interpretations is a necessary component in personality assessment, the

research, thus far, does not address whether or not these interpretations are valid. Wyman's (1998) study was the first to purport the usefulness of the Enneagram in conjunction with the MBTI for therapeutic purposes but still lacks empirical support. While, the results of these studies add to the body of literature on the Enneagram, the questions regarding the psychometric nature of the Enneagram and the validity of the interpretations still need investigating.

As Enneagram systems began to proliferate in the field of personality, more rigorous studies began to appear in the literature in relation to the reliability and validity of the interpretations of these systems. For example, Wagner (1981) conducted a reliability, concurrent validity, and predictive validity study of the Enneagram personality typology in his dissertation. Reliability was assessed on subjects (N = 390; 79 males and 311 females) who met the criteria for knowing the Enneagram and their ability to judge which Enneagram type best fit them. "No controls were set, however, on the amount of time the person had to learn about the Enneagram or on the amount of time elapsed between when the subject first learned the Enneagram system and when recontacted" (Wagner, 1981, p. 159). This time period ranged between two months and nine years. To assess concurrent validity Wagner used the MBTI (Myers & Briggs, 1976) and the Millon-Illinois Self-Report Inventory (Millon; Millon, 1974). No controls were established for the subjects' sequencing of taking these measures. The statistical techniques utilized to assess for concurrent validity were one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). "One-way ANOVA's were computed for each of the nine Enneagram types by each of the nine Millon inventory scales, by each of the MBTI raw-score scales, and by each of the MBTI converted-score scales" (Wagner, 1981, p. 162). In addition, t-tests were performed for all subsamples.

"For the predictive validity section of this study, the author constructed the Enneagram Personality Inventory" (Wagner, 1981, p. 154). The result of the reliability evaluation was 80%.

"In this study the term reliability referred to the consistency and stability of the individual's self-perceptions" (Wagner, 1981, p. 213). Concerning concurrent validity, "the results showed that there were significant differences among the nine Enneagram types and their scores on both the MBTI and the Millon" (Wagner, 1981, p. 215). The results maintained that both convergent and discriminant validity was indicated. However, predictive validity, while better than chance, was not upheld.

Further, Wagner and Walker (1983) published research on the reliability and concurrent validity of the Enneagram personality typology that was included in Wagner's (1981) dissertation. Results indicated at least a .79 reliability rate or greater. "One-way ANOVA's of the nine Enneagram types by each of the Millon (Millon, 1974) scales and each of the MBTI (Myers & Briggs, 1976) raw score and converted score scales demonstrated highly significant and congruent differences among the Enneagram types" (p. 714). Predictive validity indicated significant correlation between the criterion and the scores on the corresponding scale of the Enneagram Personality Inventory. "Cohen's Kappa coefficient for the initial administration of the instrument was .284. For the second administration, the coefficient increased to .403.

An investigation by Thrasher (1994) explored the relationship between the Enneagram personality types and unhealthy subjects. Subjects included 149 Enneagram-knowledgeable adults. Thrasher (1994) predicted that each of the nine personality types of the Enneagram would show similarities of the other types when subjects are not healthy. In this dissertation the Wagner-Thrasher Enneagram Scale (Wagner, 1981), the State-Trait Anxiety Indicator (Spielberger, 1977), and the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & Briggs, 1976) were administered. Results indicated congruence between self-typing and the results on the Enneagram (Thrasher, 1994). No evidence was found for movement between types (movement

toward other Enneagram types). In addition, Thrasher (1994) concluded that the Enneagram appears to be a valid measure of personality.

Other investigations of the Enneagram system assessed the predictability of the type patterns. For example, Twomey's (1995) dissertation was a correlational study designed to assess if Enneagram types and archetypes occur in predictable patterns in 185 adults. The measures used were the Heroic Myth Index, a measure that assesses evidence of twelve primary archetypes, and the Wagner Enneagram Inventory (Wagner, 1981), a measure of nine Enneagram behavior patterns. Similar to Thrasher (1994), Twomey (1995) tested movement between stress and security points on the Enneagram. Results indicated that progressive movement or high positive Enneagram scores were correlated ($r = .6$; $\alpha = .001$) with an archetype in Pearson's Self stage. Furthermore, analogous to Thrasher's (1994) findings, movement along paths due to anxiety and ego strength was not significant.

Concurrent validity scores from the Cohen-Palmer Inventory (Palmer, 1988) was established with two personality measures using one-way analysis of variance. According to Palmer (1988), results indicate that significant differences exist in depression, psychopathic deviation, psychasthenia, and social introversion of the clinical scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Hathaway & McKinley, 1982). This inventory was also compared with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & Briggs, 1976). Results indicated that types Three, Seven, Eight, and Two of the Cohen-Palmer Inventory correspond with extroversion. Types Five, Nine, One, and Six correspond with introversion (Palmer, 1988).

Zinkle (1975) reported that to establish reliability or item stability, using test-retest methods, 76 subjects completed the inventory with a one-month interval between administrations. Item stability results yielded correlations from .58 to .98. Additionally, Zinkle

(1975) utilized expert judge ratings to determine validity. Out of 76 subjects who studied the Enneagram, 56% resulted in agreement of type. Results of Zinkle's (1975) study show a wide range of reliability and questionable validity. Additionally, the number of subjects appears to be insufficient and may not be representative of the population.

Sharp (1994) conducted a factor analytic study of the Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI; Holland, 1985) and three Enneagram personality inventories designed by Cohen and Palmer (Palmer, 1988), Wagner (1981), and Zinkle (1974) using 335 subjects (males = 129 and females = 206). "For this analysis of all Enneagram inventories, the type scales became the variables used in the iterated principal factor analysis" (Sharp, 1994, p. 120). The combined analysis of the three Enneagram inventories produced six factors. These six factors were Ambition, Anxious Compulsion, Palmer General, Excess, Positive Extraversion, and Denial. Additionally, separate factor analyses of each Enneagram inventory with the VPI (Holland, 1985) addressed the question of what relationships exist between the VPI (Holland, 1985) types and the Enneagram types (Sharp, 1994). The analysis of the VPI (Holland, 1985) with the Cohen-Palmer Inventory (Palmer, 1988) resulted in five factors. These five factors were the General Palmer, Social Sensitivity, Social Aversion, Ambition, and Industrious. The analysis of the VPI (Holland, 1985) with the Wagner Inventory (1981) produced eight factors. These eight factors were the General Wagner, Social Aversion, Achievement Orientation, Social, Social Status, Industrious, Hesitation, and Artistic. Finally, the analysis of the VPI (Holland, 1985) with the Zinkle (1975) produced seven factors that included Social Competency, Social Insecurity, Estrangement, Social Aversion, Social Ambition-2, Industrious, and Constriction.

The Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator, Version 2.5 (RHETI; Riso & Hudson, 1999) is a measure of normal personality typology. According to R. Hudson, (personal

communication, April 14, 2000) the RHETI was developed using self-assessment, expert judge, and observer agreement. Additionally, criterion-keyed strategies were utilized to refine the items so that the items selected would be based on the ability to discriminate criterion groups.

While a paucity of literature exists on the reliability and validity of the RHETI, some research has made movement to better understanding the RHETI system. Edwards (1991) investigated if university students (twenty-four males and twenty-four females) presented with brief descriptions of the nine Enneagram types identified by Riso (1990) would perceive maximal similarity between types which are represented by adjacent numbers. Results suggested that the frequency of certain types grouped together were around chance-based expectation. This is consistent with the theory reported by Riso (1990). However, "in the case of Type Four and Type Five, the two types were placed together much more frequently than chance would predict" (Edwards, 1991, p. 15).

In another investigation, Newgent, Gueulette, and Parr (in press) conducted an exploratory study of the RHETI, Version 2.5 (Riso & Hudson, 1999). Forty-four subjects completed the RHETI and the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992). Results of a correlational analysis between the types on the RHETI and the factors on the NEO PI-R indicated several significant relationships supporting construct validity. RHETI type One (Reformer) had a significant positive relationship with the NEO PI-R factor of Conscientiousness ($r = .43$, $p = .0033$). RHETI type Two (Helper) had a positive significant relationship with the NEO PI-R factor of Extraversion ($r = .49$, $p = .0007$). RHETI type Three (Achiever) had a significant positive relationship with the NEO PI-R factor of Conscientiousness ($r = .67$, $p = .0001$). RHETI type Four (Individualist) had significant positive relationships with the NEO PI-R factors of Neuroticism ($r = .35$, $p = .0198$) and Openness ($r = .30$, $p = .0444$) and

significant negative relationships with Extraversion (r = -.31, p = .0429) and Conscientiousness (r = -.52, p = .0001). RHETI type Five (Investigator) resulted in a significant negative relationship with the NEO PI-R factor of Extraversion (r = -.43, p = .0036) and a significant positive relationship with Openness (r = .36, p = .017). RHETI type Six (Loyalist) resulted in a significant negative relationship with the NEO PI-R factor of Openness (r = -.51, p = .0004). Next, RHETI type Seven (Enthusiast) resulted in significant positive relationship with the NEO PI-R factors of Extraversion (r = .51, p = .0004) and Openness (r = .49, p = .0008). RHETI type Eight (Challenger) resulted in significant positive relationships with the NEO PI-R factors of Extraversion (r = .48, p = .0010) and Conscientiousness (r = .31, p = .0412) and a significant negative relationship with Agreeableness (r = -.61, p = .0001). Last, RHETI type Nine (Peacemaker) resulted in significant negative relationships with the NEO PI-R factors of Extraversion (r = -.56, p = .0001) and Openness (r = -.30, p = .0514) and a significant positive relationship with Agreeableness (r = .61, p = .0001). This pilot study was the first independent psychometric evaluation of the RHETI and furthered the validation of the Enneagram system.

In a psychometric investigation of the reliability and validity of the RHETI, Newgent (2001) utilized Cronbach's (1951) alpha formula to estimate the internal-consistency reliability of the items that purport to measure each of the RHETI types. Results of the internal-consistency reliability test yielded reliabilities ranging from .56 to .82 for the types of the RHETI. A type of confirmatory factor analysis using principal components methods of the items that purport to measure each of the RHETI types was utilized to estimate concurrent validity. Results indicated an 18-factor solution or 2-factor solutions for each of the nine purported RHETI types (Newgent, 2001). However, there were significant differences between factor 1 and factor 2 in six of the nine RHETI types. Utilizing correlational analysis (Pearson Product Moment Coefficient) results

of testing for construct validity between the scores on the RHETI types and the scores on the NEO PI-R factors indicated several significant correlations. Further results of testing for construct validity between the RHETI types and the NEO PI-R factors utilizing both analysis of variance and analysis of covariance indicated that the majority of the demographic descriptive variables are invariant to the RHETI.

These empirical studies showed a trend of increasing complexity in the psychometric study of the Enneagram systems in relation to validity. Wagner's (1981) dissertation was appears to be the first empirical study of the Enneagram personality theory. However, these results were based on the subjects prior knowledge and training in the Enneagram system. Therefore, the applicability to real world situations, in which a client would be most likely unsophisticated in matters of personality measurement, still needs empirical validation. Thrasher's (1994) study does support the relationship between subjects' self-perceptions and Enneagram classification. While this is an estimate of validity, congruence in itself does not adequately denote the validity of a measure's interpretations. The Palmer (1988) study helped to further the psychometric acceptability of the Enneagram system with increased psychometric assessment and utilization of a psychometrically sound measure, unlike Sharp's (1994) use of the VPI (Holland, 1985) to compare personality constructs with occupational titles. Finally, the Newgent (2001) study furthered the trend in increased psychometric use by investigating the validity of the scores on the RHETI. While recommendations for revision were noted, this study did partially support reliability and validity.

Summary and Implications for Counseling Practice

Having presented and reviewed Enneagram classification systems of personality being utilized by counselors and other mental health professionals who work in the field of personality,

do we conclude that the research on these systems indicates a trend in validation? The first conclusion from this review is that the paucity of the professional literature on the Enneagram may be a result of many studies utilizing non-empirical support for validation. Some studies validated the Enneagram system both experientially and intuitively. Other studies that attempted to validate the Enneagram system had an insufficient sample size in which to truly assess validity. Further, some studies had no systematic manner with which data were analyzed. Later, more empirical studies, however, tend to be psychometrically sophisticated in testing for validity.

Although the quantity and quality of this research is limited, the findings do have relevance for the counseling and education professions. The field of personality research specifically related to the Enneagram appears to be going through a transformation. This transformation includes an increase in the standard of excellence and rigor in establishing psychometric reliability and validity in the Enneagram system.

These findings have implications for the counseling and education professions. First, the Enneagram system is being used more in educational situations. For example, the Enneagram system has been used in schools to assess career strengths and obstacles for at-risk students. The Enneagram system is also being used in educational situations to assess self-awareness in students, parents, teachers, and administrators. School counselors and educators who receive updated training in assessment will be able to more effectively utilize assessment devices for specific uses. Proper training and understanding of assessment will aid school counselors and educators in the appropriate selection of an assessment as well as application of the information obtained from the assessment. As more assessment measures are used in educational situations,

increased training of those that administer, interpret, and apply the information from those assessments becomes necessary.

Second, Counselor Educators are encouraged to provide counseling students with the necessary knowledge and support to evaluate the tools that are being used in the profession. The administration of a personality measure is but one step in evaluation. Counseling students are encouraged to understand not only how a personality measure is developed but also the psychometrics of the measure. Without this understanding, counseling students may inappropriately apply results and interpretations of the measure to their clients.

Further, educators are encouraged to provide opportunities for counseling students to develop the necessary skills to engage in validation research. Educators are encouraged to collaborate with research and statistics programs. This type of collaboration is consistent with the scientist-practitioner model of Counselor Education programs. Without collaboration, many counseling students will find the challenge of engaging in research and comprehending the psychometrics of the tools utilized in practice very formidable.

Finally, counseling practitioners are encouraged to understand that a trend in validation is increased rigor in the use of psychometrics, as evidence by the Enneagram literature. Counseling practitioners are encouraged to stay abreast of the most recent information on research related to personality measurement. Without updated information, counseling practitioners are ill equipped to face the challenge of the competitive marketplace.

Recommendations

This review and its implications provide insights for counseling and education professionals. They include: (a) updated training of school counselors and educators that utilize assessment devices, (b) developing an understanding that one role of the Educator is to provide

the necessary tools and support for counseling students in the field of personality measurement, (c) keeping abreast of the most recent trends in the field so as to effectively prepare counseling students for the world of work, and (d) encouraging practitioners to engage in continuing education workshops and reading relevant research literature related to personality measurement.

State departments of education and accrediting bodies that govern Counselor Education program have an integral role in maintaining the competencies and keeping abreast of the trends in education. Counselor Education programs are encouraged to stay abreast of these trends and begin to adapt and modify programming in a timely fashion so as to be most beneficial to students; the future practitioners of the counseling profession.

The measurement of personality is a complex and difficult process. Counseling and education students are gaining a greater understanding of the challenging environment in which they will be working. To help meet the aforementioned recommendations, educators are encouraged to expand their methods and ways of thinking regarding teaching personality measurement and assessment. Educators are encouraged to examine the process through which counseling students are provided information on the field of personality. The nature of the counselor education program must be examined and updated to meet the current needs of the counseling students and trends in the field. Hopefully, future educators will assist counselor students in enhancing their skills, knowledge, and attitudes regarding research and personality. Educators are encouraged to teach integration of personality assessment and theory as well as provide opportunities for counseling students to keep up with the trends in validation research.

This investigation of the Enneagram system indicates increased rigor in the psychometric examination of these assessments. Overall results indicate the Enneagram systems add to the information gained by counselors and educators. However, the psychometric assessment of these

Enneagram systems is in its' infancy. Therefore, while the Enneagram may be a useful tool, it is recommended that it be used in conjunction with other measures of personality that have stronger records of reliability and validity.

References

Brugha, C. (1998). The structure of development decision-making. *European Journal of Operational Research, 104,* 77-92.

Costa, P. Jr., & McCrae, R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cronbach, L. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16,* 297-334.

Cusack, G. (1996). Discovering the Enneagram. *Montessori Life, 8,* 34-35.

Edwards, A. (1991). Clipping the wings off the enneagram: A study in people's perceptions of a ninefold personality typology. *Social Behavior and Personality, 19,* 11-20.

Gamard, W. S. (1986). Interrater reliability and validity judgments of enneagram personality types (Doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Integral Studies, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International-B, 47,* 3152.

Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1982). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.* Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.

Holland, J. (1985). *The vocational preference inventory: professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Jung, C. (1971). *Psychological types.* (Vol. 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). *On death and dying.* New York: Macmillan.

Lanyon, R., & Goodstein, L. (1971). *Personality assessment.* New York: Wiley.

Maslow, A. (1987). *The farther reaches of human nature.* New York: Harper and Row.

Millon, T. (1974). *Millon-Illinois Self-Report Inventory.* Philadelphia: Saunders.

Myers, I., & Briggs, K. (1976). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Newgent, R. A. (2001). *An investigation of the reliability and validity of the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator.* (UMI No. 3005901)

Newgent, R., Gueulette, C., & Parr, P. (in press). An investigation of the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator constructs of personality as a unique estimate of personality when considering the Revised NEO Personality Inventory and the five-factor model of personality. *Annals of the Association for the Advancement of Educational Research and the National Academy for Educational Research.*

Newgent, R., Perosa, L. & Perosa, S. (2000). *Using the enneagram personality types to promote career exploration and identify career obstacles in a multicultural classroom setting: A collaboration initiative.* Unpublished manuscript.

Palmer, H. (1988). *The enneagram: Understanding yourself and others in your life.* San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.

Perry, A. K. (1996). Leading with skill and soul: Using the enneagram and the Brent personality assessment system (Doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International-B, 52,* 7768.

Pinder, M. (2000). Spirituality and career development: Using the enneagram. In N. Peterson & R. Gonzalez (Eds.), *Career counseling models for diverse populations: Hands-on applications by practitioners* (pp. 150-161). Australia: Wadsworth.

Riso, D. R. (1987). *Personality types: Using the Enneagram for self-discovery.* Great Britain: The Aquarian Press.

Riso, D. R. (1990). *Understanding the enneagram: The practical guide to personality types.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Riso, D. R. (1995). *Discovering your personality type: the new Enneagram questionnaire.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Riso, D. R., & Hudson, R. (1996). *Personality types: using the enneagram for self-discovery.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Riso, D. R., & Hudson, R. (1999). *The Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (Version 2.5) offprint.* New York: The Enneagram Institute.

Sharp, P. M. (1994). A factor analytic study of three enneagram personality inventories and the vocational preference inventory (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International-A, 55,* 1228.

Sherman, M. (1979). *Personality: Inquiry and application.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Spielberger, C. D. (1977). *State-Trait Anxiety Inventory.* Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Thrasher, P. (1994). The enneagram: Movement between types, an inventory, and a criterion Measure (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International-B, 55,* 1217.

Twomey, J. A. (1995). The enneagram and Jungian archetypal images (Doctoral dissertation, Chicago School of Professional Psychology, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International-B, 57,* 1490.

Wagner, J. P. (1981). A descriptive, reliability, and validity study of the enneagram personality typology (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International-A, 41,* 4664.

Wagner, J., & Walker, R. (1983). Reliability and validity study of a Sufi personality typology: the enneagram. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39,* 712-717.

Wyman, P. (1998). Integrating the MBTI and the Enneagram in psychotherapy: The core self and the defense system. *Journal of Psychological Type, 46,* 28-40.

Zinkle, T. E. (1975). A pilot study toward the validation of the Sufi personality typology (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International-B, 35,* 2418.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Enneagram: Trends in Validation
Author(s): Rebecca A. Newgent, Patricia E. Parr, and Isadore Newman
Corporate Source: University of Arkansas at Fayetteville The University of Akron — Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to each document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified documents, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate these documents as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Rebecca A. Newgent	Printed Name/Position/Title: Rebecca A. Newgent, Ph.D., L.P.C./ Counselor Educator/Assistant Professor	
Organization/Address: 236 Graduate Education Building ELCF – University of Arkansas Fayetteville AR 72701	Telephone: 479-575-7311	FAX: 479-575-2492
	E-Mail Address: rnewgent@uark.edu	Date: 10-10-2002

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of these documents from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of these documents. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: **ERIC Counseling & Student Services**
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
201 Ferguson Building
PO Box 26171
Greensboro, NC 27402-6171

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org